REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-27 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview

The Applicants express gratitude for the interview with the Examiner conducted on February 26, 2008. Although no agreement was reached regarding the claims being in condition for allowance, several features of the present application and prior art references were discussed. Also, the Applicants respectfully submitted that the Examiner had mistakenly considered the Applicants description of one of the references as a relied upon feature of a rejected claim. The Examiner acknowledged the error, and indicated that further consideration of that point would be made while considering this Response. Other portions of the discussion are also included in this Response.

Examiner's Response To Argument

On page 29 of the Office Action the Examiner acknowledged that the Applicants had argued that Onishi fails to disclose the feature in which characters of the candidate character string are being input until the input characters of the candidate character string are defined and finalized, and that Onishi does not disclose this feature because in Onishi the program is selected after the character string is input.

However, as discussed in the Examiner interview, the Examiner then went on to allege that the Applicants had relied upon a feature ("selected after the character string is input") that is not recited in the rejected claim. The Applicants respectfully submit that a careful review of the previously filed Amendment, as well as of the Examiner's own remarks in the bullet point of page 29 of the Office Action, will clearly show that the Applicants did not rely on this feature as being part of the recited claim. In fact, it is clearly seen to be one of the elements that is identified in Onishi that actually prevents Onishi from disclosing the recited claim. In other words, while the rejected claim recites the feature in which the search request for dictionary information being made while the characters are being input, Onishi cannot disclose such a feature because no

10

such search is made until after the character string is finalized.

This distinction was made clear to the Examiner during the Examiner interview. While the Examiner acknowledged the error, the Examiner went on to allege that the error did not change the basis for the current rejections of the claims. However, Applicants respectfully submit that since the Examiner apparently did not apply the correct consideration of the claims and the prior art references according to the actual arguments made in the previous Amendment, then the rejections could not be considered proper. In other words, the Examiner apparently relied upon a mistaken understanding of the arguments and features for all of the rejections of these claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the claims in light of these properly made arguments by the Applicants.

Further, the Applicants respectfully submit that it appeared from the Examiner interview that the Examiner may have not been aware that the search request for the dictionary data was issued before the finalization of the character string being input by a user. The Applicants respectfully submit that this is clearly recited in claim 1, which recites the feature wherein said search request for the dictionary data specified by the keyword is issued with respect to a plurality of dictionaries which are selected as search targets while characters of the candidate character string are being input until the input characters of the candidate character string are defined and finalized. The Applicants respectfully submit that this feature clearly shows that the search is being issued before the finalization of the character string. The Examiner cited, on page 3 of the Office Action, the section of the Applicants' specification which discloses that candidates formed by one or more undefined characters are successively displayed and one desired candidate is selected by the user (Page 18, Lines 5-10). The Applicants respectfully submit that this further shows that the character string being input by the user has not been finalized during the described process, and the recited dictionary data search request is issued before any such finalization.

Therefore, as the Examiner has been made more aware of the differences between the recited claims and the references, and since the previous arguments submitted in the Amendment of August 30, 2007 have not been properly considered and rebutted, the Applicants respectfully submit these arguments again in the following sections of this Response.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

On pages 3-4 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,154,720, issued to Onishi et al. (hereinafter

referred to as "Onishi"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of this claim.

Claim 25 of the present application recites "selecting, by a processor, at least one program displayed while characters of the candidate character string are being input until the input characters of the candidate character string are defined and finalized". The Applicants respectfully submit that Onishi does not disclose or suggest at least this feature of claim 25.

Onishi does not disclose or suggest, among other things, selecting a program while inputting a candidate character string, and defining and finalizing the candidate character string. Rather, in the disclosure of Onishi, the program is selected after the character string is input. In other words, after the character string is defined and finalized.

This is in direct contrast to claim 25 of the present application, in which the program is selected while characters of the candidate characters string are being input until the input characters of the candidate character string are defined and finalized.

Therefore, Onishi does not disclose or suggest at least the feature of "selecting, by a processor, at least one program displayed while characters of the candidate character string are being input until the input characters of the candidate character string are defined and finalized." Accordingly, Onishi does not disclose every element of the Applicants' claim 25. In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim (MPEP §2131). Therefore, since Onishi does not disclose the features recited in independent claim 25, as stated above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 25 patentably distinguishes over Onishi, and withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection is earnestly and respectfully solicited.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

On pages 4-28 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-24, and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,247,010, issued to Doi et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Doi") in view Onishi. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

Claim 1 of the present application recites a computer having a character input function "wherein said search request for the dictionary data specified by the keyword is issued with respect to a plurality of dictionaries which are selected as search targets while characters of the candidate character string are being input until the input characters of the candidate character string are defined and finalized." In other words, similar to claim 25 discussed in the previous

section of this Response, the search request is issued before the candidate character string is defined and finalized. The Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the cited references disclose or suggest at least this recited feature of claim 1.

As discussed in the previous section of this Response, Onishi does not disclose, suggest, nor even contemplate inputting a candidate character string, and defining and finalizing the candidate character string. Rather, Onishi discloses issuing a search request after the character string is defined and finalized.

Further, Doi does not cure the deficiencies of Onishi in regard to claim 1. Similar to Onishi, Doi does not disclose, suggest, nor even contemplate inputting a candidate character string, and defining and finalizing the candidate character string. As in Onishi, Doi issues a search request only after the character string is defined and finalized.

This is in direct contrast to claim 1 of the present application, in with the search request is issued while characters of the candidate character string are being input until the input characters of the candidate character string are defined and finalized.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest at least the feature of claim 1 discussed above. For a proper §103 rejection, the cited references must disclose all of the features of the rejected claim. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Further, the Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine Doi and Onishi. The Examiner alleged that one would modify Doi to include a means of displaying a menu screen indicating registered dictionaries as taught by Onishi. However, Onishi does not display registered dictionaries, as alleged by the Examiner. The Examiner alleged that Onishi discloses indicating registered dictionaries (Column 21, Lines 20-30), and that those registered dictionaries were being broadly interpreted as registered programs. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that the semantic feature dictionary cited by the Examiner cannot be reasonably interpreted as a plurality of selectable programs, because the elements described by the Examiner are all components of the one selectable program (the semantic feature dictionary 20). "The semantic feature dictionary 20 is composed of a willed semantic feature dictionary 22, a contextual semantic feature dictionary 23, and a variable semantic feature dictionary 24" (Column 21, Lines 24-27). Further, there would be no motivation to have such a feature in Doi since Doi automatically searches through the available dictionary sources in the database until the match is found. Therefore, the combination serves no purpose.

Also, the Examiner stated that the combination would allow a user to get information on the presence or absence of information related to entered text without requiring the user to enter an explicit search instruction and a search key and without immediately displaying related information. The Applicants respectfully submit that such a result, even if possible, would teach away from any such combination. The Examiner seems to suggest that information is searched for without any request by the user, and then the information is not displayed. There would seem to be no purpose for such a modification. Also, the Applicants do not see how such a modification is possible by combining the references discussed by the Examiner.

MPEP §2143.01 states that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so. Therefore, as there is no requisite motivation to combine the references cited by the Examiner, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's §103 rejections.

Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-3 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Claim 4 of the present application recites a computer having a character input function "displaying a menu screen indicating a plurality of registered programs when the keyword is detected." The Examiner acknowledged that no such feature is disclosed in Doi, but went on to allege that Onishi discloses this feature through the components of the semantic feature dictionary. However, as discussed previously in this Amendment, the semantic feature dictionary is not a plurality of registered programs being displayed. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 also patentably distinguishes over the cited references.

Claims 5-7 depend from claim 4 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5-7 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Independent claims 4, 8, 11, 14-24, and 26-27 all recite similar features to those discussed in claim 1, and which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4, 8, 11, 14-24, and 26-27 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Claims 5-7 depend from claim 4, claims 9-10 depend from claim 8, and claims 12-13 depend from claim 11. These dependent claims include all of the features of the respective independent claims upon which they depend, plus additional features which are not disclosed or

14

suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5-7, 9-10, and 12-13 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Summary

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: ____February 27, 2008____   By: _____

Thomas L. Jones
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501